The items discussed are as follows:

1. Regarding the apparatus claims 18, 21, and 26-27, the applicants informed the examiner that they are considering amending the claims to overcome the art of record. However, no such amendments were presented to the examiner during the interview.

2. Regarding the method claim 1, from which claims 2-8, 10, 15-16, and 22-25 depend, the applicants first conveyed the importance of step (a) reducing the pressure in the pore structure <u>prior</u> to contacting the surface of the evacuated channel walls with a liquid. This provides a homogenous dispersion of coating <u>within</u> the wall, and avoids caking <u>on</u> the wall.

The applicants then argued that the combination of Hoyer with Brisley is inappropriate since Hoyer applies to flow through filters, which are physically and functionally different from the wall flow filters of Brisley and the instant invention.

During the discussion, the applicants clarified the difference between wall flow filters and flow through filters as follows. In flow through filters, the fluid passes directly from one end of each channel in the filter to the other end without necessarily passing through the wall. However, in wall flow filters, one end of each channel is plugged, wherein the plugs are on alternating ends of adjacent channels. The result is that in wall flow filters, the fluid must pass through the wall.

The applicants argue that the improvement of the instant invention is a homogeneous dispersion of the catalyst wash throughout each channel wall, in comparison with the prior art, where the catalyst wash caked on the surface of the channel wall, but did not homogeneously disperse within it.

Application/Control Number: 10/591,632 Page 3

Art Unit: 1735

In response, the examiner noted that he will reconsider the applicability of the art and combination of the art after receipt of the applicants' pending response to the Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSHITOSHI TAKEUCHI whose telephone number is (571) 270-5828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:30-3:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica L. Ward can be reached on (571) 272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YOSHITOSHI TAKEUCHI/

Examiner, Art Unit 1735

/JESSICA L. WARD/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1735